

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
BOSTON REGION

SRS  
13.4  
238229

In the Matter of:

PUBLIC HEARING:

RE: SOLVENTS RECOVERY SERVICES SUPERFUND SITE

Town Hall  
75 Main Street  
Southington, Connecticut

Thursday  
June 30, 2005

The above entitled matter came on for hearing,  
pursuant to Notice at 7:00 p.m.

BEFORE:

MARY JANE O'DONNELL, Section Chief  
JAMES MURPHY, Community Involvement Coordinator  
KAREN LUMINO, Remedial Project Manager  
EPA, Region 1  
1 Congress St., Suite 1100  
Boston, MA 02114-2023



SDMS DocID

238229

## I N D E X

SPEAKERS	PAGE
Jim Murphy	3
Mary Jane O'Donnell	3
Sev Bovino	8
Mike Riccio	10
Gus Moody	11
Donald Zeil	16

## P R O C E E D I N G S

(6:34 p.m.)

MR. MURPHY: Good evening. My name is Jim Murphy. I'm with the EPA in Boston. I just want to welcome you all here tonight. It's a public hearing on the proposed plan for Solvents Recovery Services Superfund Site. I'm going to introduce Mary Jane O'Donnell from our office in one second. I just wanted to let people know that their -- any questions or comments or -- you have are not going to be answered tonight.

They will be answered in writing as part of what we call the responsive summary. Mary Jane will mention that. But I'm just going to ask, anyone who wants to make a comment to set up to that podium over there and make your comments from there so we can make sure that we -- they're recorded. And we'll also ask people to spell their last names just so we make sure we get them right in the transcript.

And we will be around after the hearing is over, if anyone wants to, you know, discuss any of the issues that come up. Although, again, we won't be officially answering questions tonight. And I will -- I'll introduce Mary Jane O'Donnell, who's our manager from Superfund in Boston.

MS. O'DONNELL: Good evening. Welcome everyone. As Jim mentioned, my name is Mary Jane O'Donnell. I'm the

1 section chief with the Environmental Protection Agency in  
2 Boston and I will be the hearing officer for tonight's  
3 public hearing. I just want to spend a few minutes in terms  
4 of my introductory comments, just -- I wanted to explain the  
5 purpose of tonight's meeting.

6 I'll elaborate a little bit about what Jim said in  
7 terms of the format, introduce a couple of other folks that  
8 are here with us and then very briefly describe the proposed  
9 cleanup plan. We've been working on this project for a  
10 number of years and today is -- tonight is an opportunity  
11 for us to formally accept your comments on the cleanup  
12 proposal. We had a public meeting on June 8 and we -- that  
13 was sort of the kickoff of the comment period.

14 We have received a comment to extend the comment  
15 period to August 8. We will be doing that. So all the  
16 comments we receive tonight and the ones that we receive in  
17 writing, we will respond to in a document called a  
18 responsive summary. And that document is, as the name  
19 suggests, a document in which we will respond to the  
20 comments that we've received in terms of making changes to  
21 the cleanup proposal.

22 It's important for us to get a diversity of  
23 perspectives in terms of pros and cons, so we certainly  
24 welcome you to come forward tonight and raise your concerns  
25 or issues that you may have. One of the follow-up

1 activities to this meeting is we will come out with a Record  
2 of Decision, which is our actual legal document that  
3 describes our cleanup plan.

4 That document will be a matter of public record.  
5 It will be in the Southington Library. And as part of that  
6 document will be this responsive summary that I alluded to  
7 earlier. In terms of introduction, you met Jim Murphy.  
8 This is Karen Lumino, Karen is EPA's project manager. I  
9 expect Chris Lacas from the State of Connecticut to join us  
10 shortly so the various regulatory agencies have represented.

11 As Jim mentioned, the meeting's going to be in two  
12 parts, the first part is my few comments, introductory  
13 comments -- oh, I -- I'm sorry. One other key person I  
14 didn't introduce was Diana, the court stenographer.  
15 Everything that's being said tonight is being recorded and  
16 it will be part of the record.

17 Meeting format will be two parts, my comments and  
18 then we'll open -- open the floor up to your comments. I'd  
19 ask you to come forward to the microphone, identify  
20 yourself, your association with the site, and if you could  
21 also spell your name, we'd certainly appreciate that.

22 As Jim mentioned, and I'll just reiterate it  
23 again, because this is a public hearing, we won't be  
24 responding to your questions or comments. But certainly at  
25 the conclusion of this formal hearing, we will be here be

1 here as long as you'd like to answer whatever questions you  
2 might have. And again, just to -- the comment period has  
3 been extended to August 8.

4 In terms of the cleanup proposal, hopefully most  
5 of you have received our proposed -- proposed plan, either  
6 through the mail or at our June 8 meeting. Just very  
7 briefly I'm going to go over that. I'm actually just going  
8 to read it just to make sure I get it right for the record.  
9 There's six components.

10 The first component is treat waste oils and  
11 solvents of the overburdened aquifer beneath the operations  
12 area by heating them in place. The second component, we  
13 expect that part of the plan to, after the design and  
14 construction, to operate for approximately 200 days. Second  
15 component is consolidate and cap contaminated soil and  
16 wetland soil.

17 The third component, capture and treat onsite the  
18 contaminated groundwater in both the overburdened and  
19 bedrock aquifers that exceed federal drinking water  
20 standards. Monitor natural degradation of the plume outside  
21 the capture zone until the groundwater cleanup levels are  
22 achieved. Monitor -- the fourth component is monitor  
23 natural degradation of the waste oils and solvent in the  
24 bedrock aquifer.

25 And the fifth component is implement restrictions

1 on the uses of the site property and the groundwater. And  
2 then finally, monitor the groundwater and retain the cap in  
3 the long-term, perform reviews at least every five years to  
4 ensure that the remedy remains protective of human health  
5 and the environment.

6 So that's the remedy in a nutshell, it's sort of  
7 the capsule version. One note I did want to make, during  
8 our June 8 meeting, questions were raised about conversation  
9 to the Town of Southington with respect to the loss of the  
10 drinking water that's down draining of the site.

11 While we are certainly sympathetic to that  
12 concern, that is not part of our remedy, mainly because it's  
13 something that we don't have jurisdiction over. And it's --  
14 it's sort of a natural -- we call it a -- authority rests  
15 with the natural resource trustees, and the State of  
16 Connecticut really is the person who has -- or the entity  
17 that has the purview over that particular issue.

18 I just wanted to mention that because that was an  
19 issue at our June 8 meeting. And so with that as  
20 background, I was just going to open the floor to comments  
21 that you might have. And if individuals could come forward  
22 and identify themselves, their association with the site,  
23 and their comment.

24 What I'd like to do is just, since there are a  
25 number of people here, just go row by row and people who

1 want to make comments, I'll just move from the front to the  
2 back. First row? Second row?

3 MR. BOVINO: So this is not an answer session --  
4 question and answer? This is just a comment session?

5 MS. O'DONNELL: Just a comment. But as I said,  
6 we'll be here afterwards to answer a few questions.

7 MR. BOVINO: Okay, my name is Sev Bovino, S-E-V,  
8 Bovino, B-O-V-I-N-O, 285 Hightower Road in Southington, and  
9 I live in the neighborhood of where this property is  
10 located. First of all, I would recommend, since you're  
11 looking for comments, that a mailing be done because I  
12 didn't receive anything in the mail.

13 The plan should be mailed to people at least  
14 within five thousand feet so that they have time to read it  
15 and study it and then you'll have some really good comments.  
16 Have it on the paper, I understand that's the legal way that  
17 you're doing it. It doesn't catch a lot of people's  
18 attention. That's one of my comments.

19 The -- starting at the top of the plan, is this a  
20 -- my question would be is this a proven method or is it  
21 just an experiment? And if so, if it was done in the past,  
22 how many sites were -- was done and what kind of results did  
23 you get and how long did it take it to achieve the results?

24 And if the results were good results where you can  
25 actually drink the water after it's done? And if there is

1 leftover contamination? So you can see, there's a lot of  
2 questions. The other --

3 MS. O'DONNELL: And it's also difficult not to  
4 answer at this time, but I want to make sure everyone gets  
5 heard, so --

6 MR. BOVINO: Yeah. Yeah. The other is on the  
7 list of the plan is to cap the soil and the wetlands, the  
8 question would be how much area of the wetlands are you  
9 filling and are you going to apply for an Army Corps permit?  
10 The other question would be why not remove the soil? I see  
11 seventeen thousand cubic yards estimated.

12 If we're going to spend thirty years treating this  
13 water with this system, and if it is an experimental system  
14 which you're going to observe and maybe there's going to be  
15 some traces left, why not just spend maybe even more money  
16 and take the soil out and get it done once and for all  
17 instead of capping it? That would help actually the river  
18 too, because then the flood plain can be expanded and maybe  
19 additional wetlands area can be generated.

20 The other question would be why treat the water to  
21 federal drinking standards? Nobody in this town is going to  
22 go and drill a well in that area. I think the standards  
23 should be increased to a lesser degree where it would not be  
24 drinking water, it would be like an industrial area type of  
25 standard. The other question would be the plume, is the

1 plume moving or is it contained? If it was contained, why  
2 not just keep on pumping the way you're doing it now?

3 And last is -- is this going to be done by the  
4 federal government or by private consultants? And would it  
5 be a bid where you send out for more than one bid so that  
6 you have some competitive prices so we don't have somebody  
7 just making this like a gravy train where they have all the  
8 money coming in for -- without having a competitive price?

9 MS. O'DONNELL: Do you want to -- do you have  
10 anything in writing you'd like to give us? Or just the oral  
11 comments?

12 MR. BOVINO: Oral comments, you have a recording,  
13 right?

14 MS. O'DONNELL: Yes.

15 MR. BOVINO: Okay.

16 MS. O'DONNELL: I'm just trying to think in terms  
17 of after this, to respond to your questions, okay?

18 MR. BOVINO: Okay. Thank you.

19 MR. RICCIO: Mike Riccio, 208 Berlin Avenue. I'm  
20 on the town council here in town. I'm sure there's some  
21 great reason why there can't be a back and forth dialogue,  
22 but it kind of puzzles me. My comment is that -- or  
23 question, I guess, the digging up of the soil and removing  
24 it. We have some other sites here in town, you know, we've  
25 had some presentations on and it's a similar situation.

1           Treat the soil in place, cap it, and pass it on to  
2 the, you know, people a hundred years from now. I just feel  
3 that if at all possible, regardless of the expense, that  
4 soils when they're contaminated at a reasonable depth should  
5 be removed, hauled off-site, and disposed of. Thank you.

6           MS. O'DONNELL: Thank you. The third row? No?  
7 Next row?

8           MR. MOODY: Good evening, my name is Gus Moody,  
9 M-O-O-D-Y. I'm the chairman of the PRP Group technical  
10 committee. We thank the agency for setting up the hearing  
11 this evening and we thank the members of the public for  
12 taking the time to attend and to begin the process of  
13 education.

14           I began working on technical issues at the SRS  
15 site in about 1992. Over the past few years, I have worked  
16 with the technical committee of the PRP Group to complete  
17 the feasibility study, which we understand was relied upon  
18 by EPA in issuing the proposed plan under review tonight.  
19 The group has been very active on this site in working with  
20 the agency and the State of Connecticut since 1992.

21           We have installed groundwater control systems  
22 under what was called NTCRA 1 and 2 to capture and control  
23 the runoff of groundwater from the site from both  
24 overburdened and bedrock. Since the operation of those two  
25 systems began, we have removed over twelve thousand pounds

1 of contaminants from the groundwater streams. The  
2 groundwater flow is controlled and the quality of that water  
3 external to the control systems continues to improve.

4 The group has performed the RI and developed much  
5 of the FS. Although significant quantities of contamination  
6 remain, there appears to be no current risk to the public  
7 due to the site. No one is drinking the groundwater and the  
8 soil on the site is contained. The PRP Group expects to  
9 submit comments to the agency on a rolling basis through the  
10 comment period.

11 We are grateful to the agency for extending the  
12 comment period by thirty days to August 8, 2005. The  
13 comments to the agency will be coming in during the whole of  
14 that time rather than in one solid mass to help accommodate  
15 agency review period. The PRP Group is offering some  
16 preliminary comments this evening.

17 The Group is reviewing the administrator record  
18 dissembled in connection with the proposed plan. It appears  
19 that nothing was put into that record between 1998 and the  
20 recent additions associated with the plan. The recent  
21 volume of new documents and complex data proposed real  
22 challenges, especially for members of the public trying to  
23 comment meaningful -- meaningfully, pardon me, on the PRAP.

24 There has been a lot of data only very recently  
25 made available to the public. There has been no discussion

1 of alternate remedies that have not been chosen or why,  
2 especially given that all remedies will require hundreds of  
3 years to clean up the site. In particular, materials not  
4 yet in the record constitute the sole source or include  
5 additional material information regarding other items,  
6 including the following.

7           Submissions and analysis by the PRP Defense Group  
8 addressing the fact that the remedy proposed entails one of  
9 the highest costs, is more technically complex, thereby  
10 bringing with it a greater degree of uncertainty in a number  
11 of areas and in terms of whether it will work at the site.  
12 The PRP Group submissions addressing the undefined nature of  
13 the remedial goals which identify the site and whether we're  
14 -- pardon me, which identify when the site will be clean  
15 enough.

16           PRP submissions reflecting the fact that no  
17 thermal remedy has achieved MCLs at a Superfund Site with  
18 the complicated mix and concentrations of contaminants as  
19 occur on this site located above fractured bedrock. The PRP  
20 Group submission addressing the connection between other  
21 contaminated sites and the town well field, which raise  
22 questions about whether cleanup at SRS will change water  
23 quality in the former town well field in any meaningful way.

24           Comments addressing the significant airborne  
25 emission odor health risks that must be addressed to operate

1 EPA's proposed remedy. Risks absent from virtually every  
2 other alternative. We believe that that control of  
3 potential air emissions alone is sufficient to cause a pilot  
4 test be required on the thermal treatment options.

5 PRP submissions reflecting the legal and  
6 operational concerns and uncertainties raised by the lack of  
7 clearly expressed cleanup goals and the absence of any  
8 associated clearly articulated risk analysis.

9 PRP submissions noting that EPA chose to estimate  
10 costs using a discount rate -- parenthetically, that's  
11 something to attempt to estimate the current dollar value of  
12 future money -- that to the Group's knowledge is not used  
13 even by one financial institution in the United States. And  
14 which even OMB, the federal agency with relevant expertise,  
15 will not use.

16 Or that using a more accurate and commonly used  
17 rate would increase significantly the estimated amount that  
18 must be spent if the agency sticks with its proposed remedy.  
19 PRP submissions that will provide facts and details planning  
20 why SRS will, by far, be the most difficult and complex site  
21 at which any party has tried to use a thermal remedy.

22 PRP submissions that will provide facts and  
23 figures identifying how much larger in scale EPA's proposed  
24 planned thermal remedy is when compared even to those  
25 thermal remedies that have failed at other sites.

1 Submissions concerning the three previous versions of the FS  
2 to allow all parties to understand how the agency has  
3 arrived at the final document.

4 I could go on. But we wish tonight only to point  
5 out the complexity of the case, the difficulty faced by any  
6 member of the public hoping to comment meaningfully on this  
7 proposal by the close of the comment period. Frankly, we  
8 believe it would be impossible for the public and possibly  
9 even us to comment meaningfully in this brief window.

10 We do not mean to suggest that we oppose EPA's  
11 proposed remedy. We do not believe enough material  
12 information currently exists to support or oppose. We do  
13 believe that there are far too many unanswered questions to  
14 expect parties to comment meaningfully now. We plan to  
15 continue to cooperatively and constructively work with the  
16 agency, with the State of Connecticut, and with members of  
17 the public.

18 We plan to work with the agency and with the state  
19 to construct pilot tests that we hope will eliminate many of  
20 the uncertainties that will be identified by and with our  
21 comments. And we plan to be at the table with EPA, with the  
22 state, and with the public when those pilot results are  
23 complete and to further -- and to provide further input and  
24 provide the ability for the public to participate.

25 We thank you for your patience. This PRAP has

1 been a longtime coming. The process has given us a great  
2 deal of respect for the members of EPA's and DEP's case  
3 teams. They have tough jobs. We look forward to working  
4 with you all in the future. Thank you.

5 MS. O'DONNELL: Thank you, Gus. Do you want to  
6 leave us with your written comments or not?

7 MR. MOODY: I prefer not. Thank you.

8 MS. O'DONNELL: Okay. Next row? Anyone? Row  
9 behind that? Again, if you could identify yourself, if you  
10 could spell your name, and your association with the site?

11 MR. ZEIL: Good evening, my name is Donald Zeil  
12 and I'm a Southington resident, 424 Flanders Road here in  
13 Southington. This is a very serious problem. I have  
14 several questions here I'd like to present and the first one  
15 is to -- to address this situation, who is the current  
16 titleholder or owner of the property?

17 The second question is was there a 103C RCRA  
18 filing done in 1981? Were there discharge permits after  
19 1967 with this facility? Were they issued and were they  
20 monitored? Did the DEP notify the users of the facility of  
21 violations? When did the DEP issue a license to the  
22 operator? Who came in with the tentative figure of  
23 twenty-nine million dollars? This is a two hundred and  
24 fifty year remediation program?

25 And were the wells in operation before Solvent

1 Recoveries was issued a permit to operate? Who granted the  
2 permit to Solvent Recoveries? Now as far as this burn-off  
3 procedure for the volatiles -- yes, you may accomplish  
4 something, but how are you going to address the solid  
5 carcinogens such as lead?

6 Now if you could correct me, state max. limits and  
7 federal limits with lead in the water or in the soil, is it  
8 .015 parts per million or is it .05? I -- I'm not quite  
9 sure. But how would you extract the lead copper sulfates  
10 from the soil? Would this process address it? Now this is  
11 a very, you know, a very large project and two hundred and  
12 fifty years, I think, is really short.

13 I think maybe it'd be a wiser decision and safer  
14 one to buy everyone out and cap this thing. You'll never  
15 remediate this. And where would the soil go? You wouldn't  
16 -- have to burn it. Ohio is shut down, correct? Where will  
17 you go with it? Now the liabilities, I think, hold more  
18 than the two hundred and fifty clients that solicited  
19 Solvent Recoveries to take care of their business.

20 Who gave Solvent Recoveries the permit to even  
21 establish a business over there? Who issued them the  
22 license to operate it? Who was supposed to monitor it? Did  
23 they work within the guidelines? There is an awful lot, you  
24 know, to be said and done before you start trying to cook  
25 the dirt. Thank you.

1 MS. O'DONNELL: Thank you, sir. Anyone on the  
2 last two or three rows? Seeing that there aren't anymore  
3 comments, unless someone has changed their mind, the formal  
4 hearing is now closed. Diana, you can stop recording.

5 (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at 7:00  
6 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER AND TRANSCRIBER

This is to certify that the attached proceedings  
in the Matter of:

RE: SOLVENTS RECOVERY SERVICES SUPERFUND SITE

Place: Southington, Connecticut

Date: June 30, 2004

were held as herein appears, and that this is the true,  
accurate and complete transcript prepared from the notes  
and/or recordings taken of the above entitled proceeding.

Diana Strzeminski  
Reporter

06/30/2005  
Date

Heather Kelly  
Transcriber

07/08/2005  
Date